

A Remark on Boundary Effects in Static Vacuum Initial Data sets

Pengzi Miao *

April 18, 2005

Abstract

Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat static vacuum initial data set with non-empty compact boundary Σ . We prove that (M, g) is isometric to a spacelike slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of a Schwarzschild spacetime under the mere assumption that Σ has zero mean curvature, hence generalizing a classic result of Bunting and Masood-ul-Alam. In the case that Σ has constant positive mean curvature and satisfies a stability condition, we derive an upper bound of the ADM mass of (M, g) in terms of the area and mean curvature of Σ . Our discussion is motivated by Bartnik's quasi-local mass definition.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper we let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat three dimensional Riemannian manifold that has one end and non-empty smooth compact boundary Σ . Following [6], we say (M, g) is *static* if there exists a function u , called the *static potential* of (M, g) , satisfying $u \rightarrow 1$ at the end of (M, g) and

$$\begin{cases} uRic(g) &= D^2u \\ \triangle u &= 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where D^2u is the Hessian of u and $Ric(g)$ is the Ricci curvature of g . It is well known that if (M, g) and u satisfy (1), the asymptotically flat spacetime metric $\bar{g} = -u^2 dt^2 + g$ solves the Vacuum Einstein Equation on $M \setminus u^{-1}(0) \times$

*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA, pengzim@math.ucsb.edu

$\mathbb{R}$, where $u^{-1}(0)$ is the zero-set of u . It is also known that $u^{-1}(0)$, if non-empty, is an embedded totally geodesic hypersurface in M [6]. As a result, (1) implies that (M, g) has zero scalar curvature.

A classic result of Bunting and Masood-ul-Alam [4] states that, if (M, g) is static and $u = 0$ on Σ , (M, g) is isometric to a spacelike slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of a Schwarzschild spacetime with positive mass m . In particular, Σ is a connected two sphere.

The condition $u = 0$ on Σ is a natural assumption as it corresponds to that the static killing vector field ∂_t of $\bar{g}$ vanishes at Σ . On the other hand, from a point of view of quasi-local mass question, the mean curvature of Σ , denoted by H_Σ , and the induced metric on Σ , denoted by $g|_\Sigma$, also represent important boundary condition. In [1], Bartnik proposed his quasi-local mass definition and H_Σ and $g|_\Sigma$ constitute the geometric boundary constraint in his static metric extension conjecture [2] [10]. Thus, it is natural to ask whether Bunting and Masood-ul-Alam's result [4] holds under the mere assumption $H_\Sigma = 0$. We give a positive answer to this question.

Theorem 1 *Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat manifold with non-empty smooth compact boundary Σ . If (M, g) is static and Σ has zero mean curvature, then (M, g) is isometric to a spacelike slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of a Schwarzschild spacetime with positive mass m . In particular, Σ is a connected two sphere.*

An immediate corollary of Theorem 1 is a non-existence result on horizons (stable minimal two spheres) in a static and asymptotically flat manifold whose boundary has non-negative mean curvature. Our sign convention on mean curvature gives $H_{\partial B_1(0)} = 2$, where $\partial B_1(0)$ is the boundary of the Euclidean exterior region $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_1(0)$.

Corollary 1 *Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat manifold with non-empty smooth compact boundary Σ . If (M, g) is static and Σ has non-negative mean curvature, then there is no horizon (allowed to have multiple components) in M enclosing Σ .*

We end this paper by applying the idea of the proof of Theorem 1 to the case where Σ has constant positive mean curvature. As a result, we derive an upper bound of the ADM mass of (M, g) in terms of the area and mean curvature of Σ (see Section 3).

2 Proof of the Theorem

We assume that g has sufficient boundary regularity, say g is C^3 on the closure of M , then u is C^2 on the closure of M [6]. We first prove Theorem 1 under an additional assumption that u is entirely positive in M .

Proposition 1 *Assume that (M, g) is asymptotically flat and static. Suppose that (M, g) admits a positive static potential u . If Σ has zero mean curvature, then (M, g) is isometric to a spacelike slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of a Schwarzschild spacetime with positive mass m .*

Proof: The asymptotic flatness of g and the equation $\Delta u = 0$ guarantee that u has an asymptotic expansion at ∞

$$u = 1 - \frac{m}{|x|} + O(|x|^{-2}), \quad (2)$$

where m is some constant. It is a non-trivial fact of (1) that m is indeed the ADM mass of (M, g) [4]. We now consider the Green function G at ∞ defined by

$$\begin{cases} \Delta G &= 0 & \text{in } M \\ G &\rightarrow 1 & \text{at } \infty \\ G &= 0 & \text{at } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

G has its own asymptotic expansion

$$G = 1 - \frac{A}{|x|} + O(|x|^{-2}). \quad (4)$$

Since $u \geq 0$ on Σ , it follows from the maximum principle that $u \geq G$ on M , hence $m \leq A$. On the other hand, it is proved by Bray (Theorem 9 on page 206 in [3]) that $m \geq A$ for any asymptotically flat manifold M whose scalar curvature is non-negative and boundary mean curvature is zero, furthermore the equality holds if and only if (M, g) is isometric to a manifold $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$. Therefore, we have $m = A$ and Proposition 1 follows from Bray's theorem.

Next, we show that Theorem 1 holds if Σ consists of *outermost* minimal surfaces of (M, g) . A minimal surface is called *outermost* [3] if it is not contained entirely inside another minimal surface. Here “contained entirely inside” is defined with respect to the end of (M, g) .

Proposition 2 *Assume that (M, g) is asymptotically flat and static. If Σ consists of outermost minimal surfaces of (M, g) , then (M, g) is isometric*

to a spacelike slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of a Schwarzschild spacetime with positive mass m .

To prove Proposition 2, we need a lemma concerning the equation of u when restricted to a hypersurface. For a given hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$, we let Δ_Σ denote the Laplacian operator of the induced metric on Σ , ν denote the unit normal vector at Σ pointing to ∞ , A_Σ denote the second fundamental form of Σ and K_Σ be the Gaussian curvature of $(\Sigma, g|_\Sigma)$.

Lemma 1 *Assume that (M, g) is static and u is a static potential. Suppose that $\Sigma \subset M$ is a smooth compact hypersurface. Then the restriction of u to Σ satisfies*

$$\Delta_\Sigma u + H_\Sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \left(\frac{1}{2} H_\Sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2} |A_\Sigma|^2 - K_\Sigma \right) u = 0. \quad (5)$$

Proof: Let U be a Gaussian tubular neighborhood of Σ in M such that U is diffeomorphic to $\Sigma \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ and $g|_U$ has the form $g = g_t + dt^2$, where t is the coordinate of $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ and g_t is the induced metric on the slice $\Sigma \times \{t\}$. We arrange the direction of ∂_t so that ∂_t points to ∞ . At Σ , we have

$$\Delta u = \Delta_\Sigma u + H_\Sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}$ agrees with $D^2 u(\partial_t, \partial_t)$ because ∂_t is the velocity vector of a geodesic. Hence it follows from (1) that

$$\Delta_\Sigma u + H_\Sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + Ric(\nu, \nu) u = 0. \quad (7)$$

Applying the Gauss equation and using the fact g has zero scalar curvature, we have

$$Ric(\nu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} H_\Sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2} |A_\Sigma|^2 - K_\Sigma. \quad (8)$$

Lemma 1 follows from (7) and (8).

Proof of Proposition 2: The assumption that Σ consists of outermost minimal surfaces implies that Σ is area *outer minimizing* [3] [8], i.e. there is no other closed surface enclosing Σ which has less area than Σ . In particular, Σ is stable with respect to the second variation of area inside (M, g) , hence we have

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma f|^2 - (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_\Sigma|^2) f^2 \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

for any $f \geq 0$ on Σ . Now by a general fact that, for any fixed h ,

$$\inf_{f>0} \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} f|^2 - h f^2}{\int_{\Sigma} |f|^2} \right\} = \inf_{f \in W^{1,2}(\Sigma)} \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} f|^2 - h f^2}{\int_{\Sigma} |f|^2} \right\}, \quad (10)$$

we see (9) holds without requiring $f \geq 0$. In particular, we can choose $f = u$ to have

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} u|^2 - (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_{\Sigma}|^2) u^2 \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 1 and the assumption $H_{\Sigma} = 0$ that

$$\Delta_{\Sigma} u + Ric(\nu, \nu) u = 0. \quad (12)$$

Multiplying it by u and integrating by parts, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} [|\nabla_{\Sigma} u|^2 - (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_{\Sigma}|^2) u^2] + |A_{\Sigma}|^2 u^2 = 0. \quad (13)$$

Hence, (11) and (13) imply that

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} u|^2 - (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_{\Sigma}|^2) u^2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

It follows from (9) and (14) that, on each connected component of Σ , either u is identically zero or u is the first eigenfunction with eigenvalue 0 of the operator $\Delta_{\Sigma} - (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_{\Sigma}|^2)$, in which case u must not change sign. Suppose $u < 0$ on some component of Σ , we consider

$$M_+ = \{x \in M \mid u(x) > 0\}. \quad (15)$$

It follows from the fact $u^{-1}(0)$ is an embedded totally geodesic hypersurface on which $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}$ is a non-zero constant that M_+ has smooth compact boundary ∂M_+ on which $u \geq 0$. Let M_+^{∞} be the connected component of M_+ that contains the asymptotic flat end of M , it follows from Proposition 1 that (M_+^{∞}, g) is isometric to a Schwarzschild spacetime slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$. In particular, ∂M_+^{∞} is the unique connected outermost horizon of (M, g) on which $u = 0$. Therefore, Σ must agree with ∂M_+^{∞} by the assumption that Σ consists of outermost minimal surfaces of (M, g) . Hence, $u = 0$ on Σ which contradicts to the assumption that $u < 0$ on some component of Σ . We conclude that u must be non-negative on Σ and Proposition 2 follows from Proposition 1.

We now can finish the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1: The assumption that Σ is a minimal surface implies that the outermost minimal surface of (M, g) , denoted by Σ' , always exists in M [3] [8] (Σ' may have multiple components). Let M^∞ be the region of M outside Σ' , Proposition 2 implies that (M^∞, g) is isometric to a Schwarzschild spacetime slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$. We now resort to a recent result of Chruściel [5] on the analyticity of static vacuum metrics at non-degenerate horizons. By the section 4 in [5], (M, g) admits a global analytic atlas (even across $u^{-1}(0)$) with respect to which u and g are both analytic. Since the unique analytic continuation of the manifold $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ is the whole Schwarzschild spacetime slice $M^S = (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}, (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$, we see that (M, g) is isometric to a region D of M^S , where D contains the entire upper half end $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ and ∂D is a minimal surface. However, M^S contains no minimal surface other than its neck at $\{|x| = \frac{m}{2}\}$, we conclude that Σ agrees with Σ' . Theorem 1 is proved.

A similar argument also gives a proof of Corollary 1.

Proof of Corollary 1: Suppose that (M, g) admits a horizon Σ' enclosing Σ (Σ' may have multiple components). Let M^∞ be the region of M outside Σ' , Theorem 1 implies that (M^∞, g) is isometric to a Schwarzschild spacetime slice $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0), (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 1, we know that (M, g) is isometric to a region D in a whole Schwarzschild spacetime slice $M^S = (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}, (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$, where ∂D is a closed surface in the lower half end $(B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0) \setminus \{0\}, (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ of M^S . Since $H_\Sigma \geq 0$, the mean curvature of ∂D computed with respect to the unit normal vector pointing towards the horizon neck $\{|x| = \frac{m}{2}\}$ is non-negative. However, $(B_{\frac{m}{2}}(0) \setminus \{0\}, (1 + \frac{m}{2|x|})^4 \delta_{ij})$ is foliated by a family of constant negative mean curvature surfaces $\{|x| = r\}$, the maximum principle implies that ∂D does not exist. Hence, there is no horizon in (M, g) enclosing Σ and Corollary 1 is proved.

3 An upper bound of the ADM mass

In [1] Bartnik proposed his quasi-local mass definition for a compact region (Ω, g_Ω) isometrically contained in an asymptotically flat manifold with non-negative scalar curvature. He further conjectured that there exists a static and asymptotically flat manifold (M_b, g_b) with boundary, depending only on the boundary data $H_{\partial\Omega}$ and $(\partial\Omega, g_\Omega|_{\partial\Omega})$, such that the ADM mass of (M_b, g_b) achieves the Bartnik's quasi-local mass of (Ω, g_Ω) . Therefore, as a

step to understand Bartnik's quasi-local mass of a boundary surface, it is interesting to estimate the ADM mass of a given static and asymptotically flat manifold (M, g) in terms of its boundary data H_Σ and $(\Sigma, g|_\Sigma)$.

We consider the simplest case where $H_\Sigma = H_0$, a positive constant. Motivated by the role played by stable minimal surfaces in the proof of Theorem 1, we assume Σ satisfies an additional stability assumption. For a constant mean curvature surface Σ' , we say Σ' is *mean-stable* if

$$\int_{\Sigma'} |\nabla_{\Sigma'} \phi|^2 - (\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A_{\Sigma'}|^2) \phi^2 \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

for any ϕ satisfying $\int_{\Sigma'} \phi = 0$. A result of Huisken and Yau [9] states that, for any asymptotically flat manifold (M^3, g) whose mass is strictly positive, there is a unique foliation of mean-stable constant mean curvature spheres in the asymptotic region.

Proposition 3 *Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat and static manifold with connected boundary Σ . Assume that $H_\Sigma = H_0$ and $K_\Sigma \geq \frac{1}{4}H_0^2$. Then, if Σ is mean-stable,*

$$m \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{H_0^2 |\Sigma|}} m_H(\Sigma), \quad (17)$$

where m is the ADM mass of (M, g) , H_0 is a positive constant, $|\Sigma|$ is the area of Σ and $m_H(\Sigma)$ is the Hawking quasi-local mass of Σ . The equality holds if and only if (M, g) is Euclidean.

Proof: We first show that the assumption $K_\Sigma \geq \frac{1}{4}H_\Sigma^2$ and $H_\Sigma > 0$ guarantees that $0 < u < 1$ in M unless g is flat. Applying Lemma 1 to $\Sigma = \partial M$, we have

$$-H_\Sigma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \Delta_\Sigma u + \left(\frac{1}{2} H_\Sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2} |A_\Sigma|^2 - K_\Sigma \right) u. \quad (18)$$

Let $p \in \Sigma$ such that $u(p) = \min_\Sigma u$. Suppose $u(p) \leq 0$, then $u(p) = \min_M u$ because $\Delta u = 0$ and $u \rightarrow 1$ at ∞ . Hence, $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(p) > 0$ by the Hopf strong maximum principle. Therefore, $H_\Sigma(p) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(p) > 0$ by the assumption $H_\Sigma > 0$. On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{2} H_\Sigma^2(p) - \frac{1}{2} |A_\Sigma|^2(p) - K_\Sigma(p) \leq \frac{1}{4} H_\Sigma^2(p) - K_\Sigma(p) \leq 0 \quad (19)$$

by the assumption $\frac{1}{4} H_\Sigma^2 \leq K_\Sigma$, and $\Delta_\Sigma u(p) \geq 0$ by the maximum principle. Therefore, we get a contradiction to (18). Hence, $\min_\Sigma u > 0$. A similar argument shows that $\max_\Sigma u < 1$ unless $u \equiv 1$, in which case (M, g) is flat.

It then follows from the maximum principle that $0 < u < 1$ in M unless $u \equiv 1$.

Next, we define $v = \log u$, it follows from (5) that

$$\Delta_\Sigma v + |\nabla_\Sigma v|^2 + H_\Sigma \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \frac{1}{2}(2K_\Sigma - H_\Sigma^2 + |A_\Sigma|^2). \quad (20)$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{S_\infty} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = \int_{S_\infty} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 4\pi m \quad (21)$$

and

$$\Delta v + |\nabla v|^2 = \frac{1}{u} \Delta u = 0. \quad (22)$$

Integration by parts, we have

$$4\pi m + \int_M |\nabla v|^2 = \int_\Sigma \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}. \quad (23)$$

Integrating (20) on Σ and applying $H_\Sigma = H_0$ and (23), we have

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma v|^2 + H_\Sigma \int_M |\nabla v|^2 + 4\pi m H_\Sigma = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma (|A_\Sigma|^2 - H_\Sigma^2) + 4\pi, \quad (24)$$

where we used $\int_\Sigma K_\Sigma = 4\pi$ by the Gauss-Bonnet theorem and the fact that $K_\Sigma > 0$. We now apply the mean-stable condition to get a L^2 estimate of $|A_\Sigma|$. We follow an idea in [7] and choose ψ to be a conformal map of degree 1 which maps $(\Sigma, g|_\Sigma)$ onto the standard sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Using the conformal group of S^2 , we can arrange that each component ψ_i of ψ , $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfies $\int_\Sigma \psi_i = 0$. On the other hand, the Dirichlet integral is conformal invariant in dimension 2, so

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma \psi_i|^2 = \int_{S^2} |\nabla_{S^2} x_i|^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}.$$

Applying the mean-stability condition (16) to ψ_i and summing over i , we get

$$8\pi \geq \int_\Sigma (Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_\Sigma|^2). \quad (25)$$

It follows from the Gauss equation and the fact g has zero scalar curvature that

$$Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A_\Sigma|^2 = \frac{1}{2} H_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} |A_\Sigma|^2 - K_\Sigma. \quad (26)$$

Hence, (25) implies

$$12\pi - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} H_0^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} |A_{\Sigma}|^2 \quad (27)$$

by the Gauss-Bonnet theorem. It follows from (24) that

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} v|^2 + H_0 \int_M |\nabla v|^2 + 4\pi m H_0 \leq 16\pi - \int_{\Sigma} H_0^2. \quad (28)$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{4\pi H_0} \left[\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} v|^2 + H_0 \int_M |\nabla v|^2 \right] + m \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{H_0^2 |\Sigma|}} m_H(\Sigma), \quad (29)$$

where

$$m_H(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\Sigma} H^2 \right) \quad (30)$$

is the Hawking quasi-local mass of Σ . Proposition 3 follows from (29).

Corollary 2 *Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat and static manifold with boundary Σ . Assume that $(\Sigma, g|_{\Sigma})$ is isometric to the standard unit sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and Σ has constant mean curvature 2. If Σ is mean-stable, then (M^3, g) is isometric to $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_1(0)$.*

Proof: The boundary assumption implies that $m_H(\Sigma) = 0$. Hence, Proposition 3 implies that $m \leq 0$. On the other hand, we can glue the Euclidean ball $B_1(0)$ and (M, g) along the boundary and the generalized positive mass theorem in [11] implies that $m \geq 0$. Therefore, $m = 0$ and (M, g) is isometric to the Euclidean exterior region $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_1(0)$ by the theorem in [11].

Remark One can also prove Corollary 2 by showing that (27) implies $A_{\Sigma} = g|_{\Sigma}$ and proving $u \equiv 1$ in a way similar to the derivation of $0 < u < 1$ in Proposition 3. We choose the above proof to demonstrate the expectation that a static metric might be the minimal mass metric, hence minimizes the ADM mass.

Acknowledgement The author is grateful to P Chruściel for explaining the analyticity of static vacuum metrics at non-degenerate horizons.

References

- [1] Bartnik R 1989 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** p 2346-2348
- [2] Bartnik R 1997 *Tsing Hua lectures on geometry & analysis (Hsinchu, 1990–1991)* (Internat. Press, Cambridge, MA) p 5-27
- [3] Bray H L 2001 *J. Differential Geom.* **59** p 177–267
- [4] Bunting G L and Masood-ul-Alam A K M 1987 *Gen. Relativity Gravitation* **19** p 147-154
- [5] Chruściel P T 2004 On analyticity of static vacuum metrics at non-degenerate horizons *Preprint* gr-qc/0402087
- [6] Corvino J 2000 *Comm. Math. Phys.* **214** p 137-189
- [7] Christodoulou D and Yau S T 1986 *Contemp. Math.* **71** p 9–14
- [8] Huisken G and Ilmanen T 2001 *J. Differential Geom.* **59** p 353–437
- [9] Huisken G and Yau S T 1996 *Invent. Math.* **124** p 281–311
- [10] Miao P 2003 *Comm. Math. Phys.* **241** p 27-46
- [11] Miao P 2002 *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **6** p 1163–1182